



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,537	07/31/2001	Bernd Barthel	Missling Case 325A	4891

7590 05/20/2003

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL  
& TANIS, P.C.  
2026 Rambling Road  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699

EXAMINER

ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,537

Applicant(s)

BARTHEL ET AL.

Examiner

M. Alexandra Elve

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1725

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US Pat. 4,837,416) in view of ASM Glossary of Metallurgical Terms (p. 69).

Yamamoto et al. discloses an EDM wire which has a stainless steel core and is coated with an alloy material. The ratio of the sectional area of the core material to the whole sectional area is limited to 30 to 90%. One of the coating materials is a brass plating. Conductivities range from 15 to 73%. One of the wire strengths is 182 kg/mm<sup>2</sup> (or approximately 1800 N/mm<sup>2</sup>). The steel processing, patenting, is not taught, the exact carbon content or the exact conductivity.

ASM defines steel as an iron based alloy which contains less than 2.5% carbon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a steel containing less than 2.5% carbon, as taught by ASM, in the Yamamoto et al. wire because this is the compositional range which defines a steel.

Art Unit: 1725

The prior art discloses a product substantially similar to a claimed product, differing only in the manner by which it is produced. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed compositions to have been obvious because of the similarity in the properties, and overlapping ranges. The burden falls to the applicant to show that any process steps associated with the claimed product result in a materially different product from those of the prior art, because there is nothing in the record before the examiner to reasonably conclude that applicant's product differs in kind from those obtained by the references. See In re Brown 173 USPQ 685 and In re Fessmann 180 USPQ 324.

If a composition is physically the same, it must have the same properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore the prior art teaches the same chemical composition, the properties of instant claims are necessarily present. See In re Spada, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658. Further, in view of this overlap in composition, the composition taught by the reference would be expected to possess the same properties of applicant's claimed material. See In re Best 195 USPQ 430.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Upon carefully reviewing Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2003 the Examiner acknowledges the addition of claims 6-7.

Art Unit: 1725

4. Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2003 (paper # 6) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that patenting, carbon content, strengths and conductivities are not taught. The examiner respectfully disagrees because ASM defines a steel as containing less than 2.5% carbon. Additionally, the prior art discloses a product substantially similar to a claimed product, differing only in the manner by which it is produced. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed compositions to have been obvious because of the similarity in the properties, and overlapping ranges. The burden falls to the applicant to show that any process steps associated with the claimed product result in a materially different product from those of the prior art, because there is nothing in the record before the examiner to reasonably conclude that applicant's product differs in kind from those obtained by the references. See In re Brown 173 USPQ 685 and In re Fessmann 180 USPQ 324.

If a composition is physically the same, it must have the same properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore the prior art teaches the same chemical composition, the properties of instant claims are necessarily present. See In re Spada, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658. Further, in view of this overlap in composition, the composition taught by the reference would be expected to possess the same properties of applicant's claimed material. See In re Best 195 USPQ 430.

Art Unit: 1725

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is (703) 308-0092. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn, can be reached on (703) 308-3318.

Any inquiry of general nature to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

May 18, 2003.

  
M. ALEXANDRA ELVE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER